

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed May 24, 2004. Claims 1 to 6, 8 to 27 and 30 to 64 were pending in this case. Claim 7, 28 and 29 were canceled previously. Applicant affirms the election, with traverse, of Claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 27. Claims 31 to 64 are accordingly withdrawn. Claims 1, 6, 14, 20 and 22 are being amended herein. No new matter has been added in the amendments. A check in the amount of \$430.00 is submitted herewith to pay for a Two Month Extension of Time. However, please charge any additional fees associated with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 02-1818.

In the present Office Action, the drawings are objected to because reference element "70" is used to designate both "terminal" and "arrangement". Claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because "a fuse element visible to a person viewing the body and terminals" in Claim 1 has been deemed indefinite. Also, "to enable a single bus to supply one of ... pairs" in Claim 1 has been deemed indefinite. A "substrate" in Claim 6 is also said to create indefiniteness.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 11 to 17 and 20 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,280,253 to Kraus et. al ("*Kraus*"). Claims 2, 3, 10, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of *Kraus* and U.S. Patent No. 3,909,767 to Williamson et al. ("*Williamson*"). Claims 1 and 4 to 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,569,880 to Galvagni et. al ("*Galvagni*") and U.S. Patent No. 4,409,729 to Shah ("*Shah*").

Regarding the drawing objection, please note the change to the specification made at page 10, line 8, which now reads "Referring now to Fig. 6, an arrangement 70 of terminals ~~70~~". This change makes Fig. 6 clear without amendment.

Regarding the §112 rejections, Claims 1 to 6 and 8 to 13 as presently presented recite that the fuse element is visible with respect to "two of the terminals fixed to the body". It should be noted that the claims even before the present clarification recited "a plurality of terminals fixed to and exposed on at least one side of the body". Claim 1 has also been clarified to recite "a single terminal bus in electrical communication with one of the terminals of each of the pairs", which is respectfully submitted to be definite. Claim 6 has been clarified to remove the word "substrate" and associated indefiniteness. Applicant respectfully submits that these §112

amendments have not been made to overcome any art of record and disavow no subject matter with respect to such art.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection in view of *Kraus*, it is clear that *Kraus* does not disclose, teach or suggest a separate fuse element contacting the terminals at a location separate from each of the replacement fuse connection portions as recited in Claim 1. Regarding Claim 14, *Kraus* does not meet the element, wherein the terminals each include a replacement fuse connection portion, and wherein the terminals of at least two pairs of each row are electrically connected by a fuse element. Regarding Claim 21, *Kraus* does not teach or suggest the element, wherein one of the terminals from the second set is electrically connected to one of the terminals of the first and third sets by at least two fuse elements, the terminal from the second set configured and arranged to connect to a terminal from each of at least two replacement fuses. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 14 and 21 and the claims depending respectively from those claims are patentable over *Kraus*.

Williamson, *Galvagni*, and *Shah* do not cure the above-described deficiencies of *Kraus*. In a telephone conversation between Applicant's representative and the Examiner on October 19, 2004, the above distinctions were discussed. It was generally agreed that the distinctions overcome the art presented in the instant Office Action. French reference 2 805 662 to Bourroux ("*Bourroux*") was also discussed. Applicant respectfully submits that *Bourroux* teaches away from the visible element as recited positively in Claims 1 and 14. *Bourroux* also does not teach or suggest the element of Claim 21, wherein one of the terminals from the second set is electrically connected to one of the terminals of the first and third sets by at least two fuse elements, the terminal from the second set configured and arranged to connect to a terminal from each of at least two replacement fuses. Applicant also refers the Examiner to arguments made in previous responses highlighting the deficiencies of *Bourroux* successfully.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of his patent application and, in the absence of more pertinent art, earnestly solicits an allowance of same. If Examiner has any questions, Applicant respectfully asks that Examiner contact the attorney designated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY Robert W. Connors
Robert W. Connors
Reg. No. 46,639
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 807-4214

Dated: October 25, 2004